



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/769,943 | 01/26/2001 | Christopher M. Jaggers | M-8783 US | 5515 |
| 7590 | 07/19/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| David L. Combs Haynes and Boone, LLP 901 Main Street, Suite 3100 Dallas, TX 75202-3789 | | | LELE, TANMAY S | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2684 | 10 |

DATE MAILED: 07/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/769,943 | JAGGERS ET AL. |
| | Examiner Tanmay S Lele | Art Unit 2684 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2004.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 32 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1 – 4, 15, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038).

Regarding claim 1, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communication device (Figure 1b), the docking station comprising: a support structure a cradle situated in the support structure to receive the wireless communication device (Figure 1b and column 3, lines 3 –5 and column 4, lines 2 –7); a display situated in the support structure (Figure 1b and column 3, line 3 –5); and an energy source internal to the docking station which supplies energy to the wireless communication device when the wireless communication device is received in the cradle (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 28 –32 and Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –52).

Helstab does not specifically teach of [a display situated in the support structure] to display information received by the docking station from the wireless communications device

(note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display situated in the support structure] to display information received by the docking station from the wireless communications device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Regarding claim 2, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communication device (Figure 1b), the docking station comprising: a docking housing (Figure 1b and column 3, lines 3 –5 and column 4, lines 2 –7); a display device, situated in the docking housing (Figure 1b and column 3, line 3 –5); a cradle disposed on the docking housing, that receives the wireless communication device (Figure 1b and column 4, lines 2 –7); a connector, situated in the cradle, that electrically couples the docking station to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –51); an internal voltage source situated in the docking housing (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32); a charging circuit, situated in the docking housing, for charging a voltage source (Figure 2b and column 4, lines 28 –32); and a switch for selectively coupling the charging circuit to the internal voltage source (Figure 2b and column 4, lines 48 –57 and column 4, lines 65 –67).

Helstab does not specifically teach of [a display device, situated in the docking housing,] that displays information received from the wireless communication device (note the brackets are

provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display device, situated in the docking housing,] that displays information received from the wireless communication device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Regarding claim 3, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Helstab further teaches of wherein the connector comprises a first terminal coupled to the internal voltage source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 – 54).

Regarding claim 4, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 3. Helstab further teaches of wherein the connector comprises a second terminal selectively coupled to the charging circuit through the switch (column 4, lines 48 – 53 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Regarding claim 15, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Helstab further teaches of further comprising means for determining whether a wireless communications device is docked at the station and for providing status information as a result of the determination (column 4, lines 21 – 27).

Regarding claim 31, Helstab teaches of a method for using a wireless communication device (Figure 2a), the method comprising: mounting the wireless communications device on a docking station that comprises: (g) a cradle for the wireless communications device (column

4,lines 2 –9), (h) a display device (column 3, lines 3 –5), (i) a connector for effecting an electrical interface to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4,lines 47 –54), (j) a station power source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32), (k) a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 –62 and column 5,lines 26 –35), and (l) a switch operable in response to information indicating whether or not a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (column 4,lines 65 – 67); causing the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communications device (column 2,lines 13 –15); and causing, in response to information that the wireless communication device is docked a the station, the charging circuit to charge the wireless communications device (column 4,lines 47 – 54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Helstab does not specifically teach of [a display device, situated in the docking housing,] that displays information received from the wireless communication device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display device, situated in the docking housing,] that displays information received from the wireless communication device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Regarding claim 32, Helstab in view of Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 31. Helstab further teaches of further comprising: using the docking station in a portable mode; and continuing to cause the station power source to be coupled to the wireless

communication device and to cause the charging circuit to charge the wireless communication device (column 4, lines 47 – 54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 27 – 32).

4. Claim 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Uchiyama (Uchiyama, US Patent Application No. 2002/0072390).

Regarding claim 5, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 4. Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of wherein the connector comprises a third terminal coupled to GND (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's charging system, Uchiyama's circuit topology, for the purposes of current flow (and therefore charging), as taught by Uchiyama.

Regarding claim 6, Helstab in view of Nojima and Uchiyama, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 5. Uchiyama further teaches of wherein the first terminal is for selective coupling to a B+ bus in the wireless communication device and the second terminal is for coupling to a wireless communication device voltage source (paragraph 0038).

5. Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) as applied to claims 4 and 15 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 7, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 4. Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of wherein the switch has a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to the first terminal of the connector (though it should be noted that in presence detected, as per column 4, lines 65 –67 and column 6, line 48 –53).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch has a pole coupled to the charging circuit and has a first terminal selectively coupled to the first terminal of the connector (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab and Nojima's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purposes of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 8, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the switch has a second terminal selectively coupled to the second terminal of the connector (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 – 53 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

Regarding claim 10, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Obata further teaches of wherein when a wireless communication device is positioned in the docking station, the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the second terminal of the connector so as to enable the charging circuit to

charge the wireless communication device voltage source (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

Regarding claim 11, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53).

Helstab and Obata do not specifically teach of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 16, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 15. Helstab further teaches of wherein the switch is operable in a response to status information to selectively couple the charging circuit to a power source of the wireless communications device when a wireless communications device is docked (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67).

Helstab does not specifically teach of to selectively couple the charging circuit to the station power source when a wireless communications device is not docked (though mention of a battery operated base is made in column 4, lines 30 –32).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or not fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of Uchiyama (Uchiyama, US Patent Application No. 2002/0072390).

Regarding claim 9, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Obata further teaches of wherein the first terminal is for selective coupling to a B+ in the wireless communication device and the second terminal is for coupling to a wireless communication device voltage source (column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 – 19).

Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata does not specifically teach of a bus.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of a bus (paragraph 0038).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima and Obata's charging system, Uchiyama's circuit topology, for the purposes of charging, as taught by Uchiyama.

7. Claim 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 12, Helstab and Nojima teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Regarding claim 13, Helstab in view of Nojima and Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Both Helstab and Freadman teach of wherein when a wireless communication device is positioned in the docking station, the switch is operable to couple the

charging circuit to the wireless communication device voltage source so as to enable the charging circuit to charge the wireless communication device voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8).

8. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 14, Helstab in view of Nojima and Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 13. Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8).

Helstab and Nojima and Freadman do not specifically teach of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of wherein the switch operates to couple the charging circuit to the docking station internal voltage source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically of when a wireless communication device is not positioned in the docking station.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima, Freadman, and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

9. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 17, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 16. Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata, do not specifically teach of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of further comprising a video interface coupled to the display device and operable to transform a video signal generated by the wireless communication device into a video signal that is compatible with the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima, and Obata's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

10. Claims 18 –21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 18, Helstab teaches of a docking station for a wireless communications

device (Figure 2a) comprising: a display device that displays information (Figure 1b and column 3, line 3 –5); and an apparatus that selectively supplies power to the communications device (Figure 2a), the apparatus including: a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the communications device the connector having at least first and second terminals (Figure 2a; column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station (Figure 2a; column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 21 –27); a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 –32); a station power source (Figure 2a, column 4, lines 28 –32); and a detector that determines whether a communications device is docked at the station and provides status information as a result of the determination (column 4, lines 19 –27).

Helstab does not specifically teach of [a display device that displays information] received from the communications device; a switch having a pole a first terminal, and a second terminal, [the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station]; [a charging circuit] coupled to the pole of the switch; [a station power source] coupled to the first terminal of the switch (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display device that displays information] received from the communications device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab in view of Nojima do not specifically teach of a switch having a pole a first terminal, and a second terminal, [the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station]; [a charging circuit] coupled to the pole of the switch; [a station power source] coupled to the first terminal of the switch (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above; further it should be noted a charging system is noted in column 4, lines 28 –32).

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of a first terminal a switch having a pole a first terminal (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19), and a second terminal (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19 and column 18, lines 30 –42), [the switch operable in response to status information indicating whether a communications device is docked at the docking station] (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19); [a charging circuit] coupled to the pole of the switch; [a station power source] coupled to the first terminal of the switch (Figure 8 and column 10, lines 30 –38, column 18, lines 1 –19).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention, to have included into Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata's charging system, Obata's circuit topology, for the purposes of selectively charging the mobile's battery upon need (as when the battery falls below a specified level), as taught Obata.

Regarding claim 19, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 18. Both Helstab and Obata further teach of wherein the first terminal of the switch is electrically coupled to the first terminal of the connector and the second terminal of the switch is electrically connected to the second terminal of the connector Helstab: column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 19 and column 18, lines 30 – 42).

Regarding claim 20, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Helstab further teach of wherein the switch operates to connect the pole terminal to the first terminal in response to status information indicating that a communications device is not docked at the docking station (column 4, lines 21 –27 and column 2, lines 13 –15)

Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata do not specifically teach of whereby the charging circuit then charges the station power source (though both have internal power supplies; Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 47 –48).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 21, Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata teach all claimed limitations as recited in claim 19. Both Helstab and Obata teach of wherein the second terminal of the connector is configured to be coupled to the wireless communications device power source when

the device is docked (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, line 65 –67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 18) and wherein the switch operates to connect the pole terminal to the second terminal of the switch in response to status information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (Helstab: column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, line 65 –67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 18).

Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata do not specifically teach of whereby the charging circuit then charges the wireless communications device power source (though both have internal power supplies; Helstab: column 4, lines 28 –32 and Obata: column 17, lines 47 –48).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab in view of Nojima and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

11. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) in view of Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262).

Regarding claim 22, Helstab teaches of a method of enhancing the capabilities of a wireless communications device for information handling (Figure 2a), the method comprising the steps: mounting the wireless communications device on a docking station (Figure 2a) that comprises: (a) a cradle for the wireless communications device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 2 – 7), (b) a display device (column 3, lines 3 –5), (c) a connector for effecting an electrical interface to the wireless communication device (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 48 –54), (d) a station power

source (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32), (e) a charging circuit (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 –32 and column 5, lines 29 –31), and (f) a switch operable in response to information indicating whether or not a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); causing the station power source to be coupled to the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67); and causing, in response to information that the wireless communication device is docked at the station, the charging circuit to charge the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 48 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and column 4, lines 21 –32).

Helstab does not specifically teach of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device or [a display device that displays information] received from the wireless communications device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display device that displays information] received from the wireless communications device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4) and further of information handling (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of coupling a video output from the wireless communications device to the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

12. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 23, Helstab in view of Nojima and Freadman teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 22. Both Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein, in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station, the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (column 4, lines 28 –32, column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Freadman: column 4, lines 5 –8),

Helstab and Nojima and Freadman do not specifically teach of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is docked at the docking station,

the switch couples the charging circuit to a voltage source included with the wireless communications device (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53) but not specifically in response to information indicating that a wireless communications device is not docked at the station, the switch couples the charging circuit to the station power source.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima, and Freadman's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

13. Claims 24, 25, and 28 –30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208).

Regarding claim 24, Helstab teaches of an assembly for docking a wireless communication device (WCD) so as to enhance the capabilities of the device (Figure 2a), the assembly comprising: a housing having a receptacle for the WCD (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 47 – 51); a display device (column 3, lines 3 – 5); an internal chargeable power source (column 4, lines 28 – 32); a charging circuit (column 4, lines 28 – 32); a switching circuit, responsive to a predetermined status of the assembly (column 4, lines 65 – 67); detachable means for coupling the charging circuit to a source of electrical power (Figure 2a and column 4, lines 28 – 32); a connector for electrically coupling the docking station to the WCD (Figure 2a and column 4,

lines 48 – 54); and a support for the housing (Figure 2a and column 1, lines 65 – 67 and column 5, lines 53 – 55).

Helstab does not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source; a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device or [a display device that displays information] received from the wireless communications device (note the brackets are provided for clarity in language and that it is believed that these limitations have been addressed in the above).

In a related art dealing with a cellular information terminal, Nojima teaches of [a display device that displays information] received from the wireless communications device (starting column 3, line 64 and ending column 4, line 4).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab's docking station, Nojima's data displaying capabilities, for the purposes of displaying user specific data and information (such as email), as taught by Nojima.

Helstab and Nojima do not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source; a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device.

In a related art dealing with handsets and cradle devices, Freadman teaches of a video interface circuit for coupling the video output of the WCD to the display device (column 3, lines 54 –63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab and Nojima's docking station, Freadman's video output, for the purposes

of displaying characters and images from a smaller screen to a larger one, as taught by Freadman.

Helstab in view of Freadman do not specifically teach of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source.

In a related art dealing with a portable terminal and cradle, Obata teaches of that selectively couples the charging circuit to the internal chargeable power source (Obata: column 17, lines 41 –53 and column 18, lines 30 –42).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima and Freadman's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 25, Helstab in view of Nojima, Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Helstab and Freadman further teach of wherein the display device is mounted on a planar surface of the housing (Helstab: column 5, lines 44 – 49 and Freadman: column 3, lines 56 –63).

Regarding claim 28, Helstab in view of Nojima, Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 25. Helstab further teaches of wherein the detachable circuit includes a line cord and a plug for insertion into an AC outlet (column 4, lines 28 –32; Figure 2a; column 5, lines 26 –35).

Regarding claim 29 Helstab in view of Nojima, Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Helstab and Obata do not specifically teach of wherein

the switching circuit is operable in a response to status information to selectively couple the charging circuit to the station power source when a WCD is not docked and to selectively couple the charging circuit to a power source of the WCD when a WCD is docked (though mention of a battery operated base is made in column 4, lines 30 –32 in Helstab and column 17, lines 47 – 48 and column 18, lines 30 –43).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, Nojima, Freadman, and Obata's charging system, Obata's means for charging the back-up battery (as when the mobile is not in the cradle or not fully charged), for the purposes of charging the back-up battery, such that the mobile could use the back-up battery when its power was not sufficient to permit transmission, as taught by Obata.

Regarding claim 30, Helstab in view of Nojima, Freadman and Obata, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 29. Both Helstab and Obata further teach of further comprising a connector for effecting an electrical connection between the assembly and the WCD, the connector comprising a first contact coupled to the internal chargeable power source and a second contact coupled to the switch means (Helstab: column 4, lines 47 –54 and column 4, lines 65 – 67 and Obata: column 18, lines 1 – 19 and column 18, lines 30 – 42).

14. Claims 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helstab et al. (Helstab, US Patent No. 6,073,031) and Nojima et al. (Nojima, US Patent No. 6,336,038) and Freadman (Freadman, US Patent No. 6,546,262) and further in view of Obata et al. (Obata, US Patent No. 5,960,208) as applied to claim 25 above Kobayashi (Kobayashi, UP Patent No. 4,776,553).

Regarding claim 26, Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, teach all the

claimed limitations as recited in claim 25. Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support for the housing is a stand having a base portion and an oblique back portion (Figures 1 – 10 and column 1, lines 40 –50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Regarding claim 27, Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, teach all the Claimed limitations as recited in claim 26. Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata, do not specifically teach of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing.

In a related art dealing with cradle mounts, Kobayashi teaches of wherein the support is rotatably attached to the housing (Figures 1 – 10 and column 1, lines 40 –50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Helstab, in view of Nojima and Freadman and Obata's cradle, Kobayashi's mounting system, for the purposes positioning a cradle at a specific angle and orientation, as specified by the user, as taught by Kobayashi.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

R
Tanmay S Lele
Examiner
Art Unit 2684

tsl
July 10, 2004

Nay Maung
NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER